

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

MISC. CIVIL APPLN.(CONTEMPT PETITION) No 761 of 1991

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE S.M.SONI and  
MR.JUSTICE R.R.JAIN

=====

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement?
4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder?
5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge?

-----  
STATE OF GUJARAT

Versus

PRINCIPAL SHREYAS VIDHALAYA

-----  
Appearance:

Mr.Y.F.Mehta, A.G.P. Petitioner

MR MH BAREJIA for Respondent No. 1, 2, 3

-----  
CORAM : MR.JUSTICE S.M.SONI and  
MR.JUSTICE R.R.JAIN

Date of decision: 18/09/96

ORAL JUDGEMENT (per Soni J.)

In view of the order dated 26.4.91 passed in M.C.A.No.307/91, suo motu proceedings are initiated against respondent nos.1 and 2.

Contempt proceedings are initiated by the court, as District Education Officer had reported that respondent - management does not extend the cooperation

assured before the court. After issuance of rule, respondent nos.1 and 2 appeared before the court.

On the last adjourned date when respondent nos.1 and 2 remained present, they stated before the court that enquiry required or proposed to be instituted against the petitioner of MCA 307/91 had been dropped in view of the petitioner having withdrawn the main petition, wherein the question of enquiry arose. Petitioner was directed to remain present before the court and the petitioner is also present before the court.

Orig. petitioner states before the court that all his grievances are satisfied by the management and he is reinstated and is in employment and there is now no problem with the management. As all his grievances are satisfied and the management has dropped the enquiry, nothing would survive in this application.

Rule came to be issued against respondent nos.1 and 2 because they were not cooperating in the enquiry, though they had assured before the court. Now, no enquiry survives, as the same is dropped and the orig. petitioner and respondent nos.1 and 2 here have dropped the matter and everything run smoothly. In view of this fact, we are of the view that the contempt proceedings should also be dropped and they are hereby dropped. Rule discharged. No costs.

---